



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,413	07/27/2000	Theron D. Tock	9803-0099-999	1174
32291	7590	10/18/2004	EXAMINER	
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP 710 LAKEWAY DRIVE SUITE 170 SUNNYVALE, CA 94085			VU, TUAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/627,413	TOCK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tuan A Vu	2124	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 22-51.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on 27 July 2000 is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants submit that the instructions added in the object code level by Hastings would become incompatible with the key words extensions by Gupta which require not reprogramming a compiler. It is noted that neither technique requires rewriting of the compiler nor do they preclude that no additional extension can be imparted in the compiled code so to provide for memory limits violation code checking, which both references do address. Also noted is that both Hastings and Gupta are geared to provide a debugger program and it is well known that for debugging, using external tables, libraries of reusable routines or/and prestored profiling/metadata information to enable code insertion for instrumentation/patching or debug does not mean that the compiler has to change unless that debugger is not efficient at all. For the other arguments raised concerning persistent object or the "scanning to automatically identify ..." limitation, these arguments have been addressed in the final rejection. It is urged though that more specificity be added to the claims to put forward features Applicants believe to be novelty. Notably in regard to the persistent objects, more amendment to the claims should be effected to overcome potential diverse interpretations by Examiner. The arguments thus far prove not persuasive; hence the resubmitted claims are not in condition for allowance and not entered.

*Kakali Chakraborty*  
KAKALI CHAKRABORTY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100